Examining Moral Issues and Concerns in Contemporary Living: Lying

A. Definition of Terms

Lying is the act of intentionally making a false statement with the aim of deceiving others. It involves misrepresentation, exaggeration, omission of truth, or manipulation of facts. Philosophically, lying is considered a moral issue because it affects trust, relationships, and societal values.

B. Kinds of Lying

Lying takes many forms, including:

1. **White Lies** – Harmless lies told to avoid hurting someone's feelings (e.g., saying "You look great" when you don't believe it).
2. **Malicious Lies** – Lies intended to harm or deceive others for personal gain (e.g., spreading false rumors).
3. **Lies of Omission** – Withholding essential information to mislead others (e.g., leaving out key facts in a legal case).
4. **Deceptive Lies** – Lies used to manipulate situations, often seen in politics and business (e.g., false advertising).
5. **Protective Lies** – Lies told to safeguard someone from harm (e.g., hiding a fugitive from an unjust authority).
6. **Compulsive Lies** – Pathological lying, where a person lies frequently without a clear reason.

C. Consequentialist and Non-Consequentialist Views

1. Consequentialist Perspective

- **Ethical Theory:** Utilitarianism (John Stuart Mill, Jeremy Bentham)
- **Main Idea:** The morality of lying depends on the consequences it produces.
- **Argument:**
  - If lying results in more happiness or prevents harm, it may be justified.
  - However, if it leads to harm, such as loss of trust or chaos in society, it is immoral.
- **Example:** Lying to protect a person from violence may be morally acceptable if it prevents harm.

2. Non-Consequentialist Perspective

- **Ethical Theory:** Deontology (Immanuel Kant)
- **Main Idea:** Lying is inherently wrong, regardless of the consequences.
- **Argument:**
  - Truthfulness is a moral duty.
  - If everyone lied, trust and communication would collapse.
- **Example:** Even if lying could save a life, a strict Kantian would argue that truth should always be upheld.

Conclusion

Lying presents moral dilemmas, and its justification depends on the ethical framework applied. While consequentialists consider the outcomes, non-consequentialists believe truthfulness is an absolute duty. In contemporary society, people often navigate lying based on cultural norms, legal implications, and personal values.

Examining Moral Issues and Concerns in Contemporary Living: Cheating

A. Definition of Terms

Cheating is the act of dishonestly gaining an advantage over others by violating rules, norms, or ethical standards. It can occur in various contexts, such as academics, relationships, business, and sports. Cheating undermines fairness, trust, and integrity in society.

Philosopher Sissela Bok (1978) in *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life* argues that cheating, like lying, erodes the foundation of trust, which is essential for social cooperation.

B. Kinds of Cheating

Cheating manifests in different forms, including:

1. **Academic Cheating** – Copying in exams, plagiarism, or using unauthorized materials.
2. **Relationship Cheating** – Being unfaithful in romantic relationships through deception or betrayal.
3. **Business and Financial Cheating** – Fraud, embezzlement, tax evasion, or insider trading.
4. **Sports Cheating** – Doping, match-fixing, or breaking the rules to gain an unfair advantage.
5. **Political Cheating** – Corruption, election fraud, or manipulation of democratic processes.
6. **Cheating in Contracts and Agreements** – Violating terms of agreements for personal benefit.

C. Consequentialist and Non-Consequentialist Views

1. Consequentialist Perspective (Utilitarianism)

- **Ethical Theory:** Utilitarianism (Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill)
- **Main Idea:** The morality of cheating depends on its consequences—whether it produces overall good or harm.
- **Arguments:**
  - If cheating leads to greater happiness or benefits society (e.g., breaking unfair rules), it may be justified.
  - However, if it causes harm, such as undermining trust or fairness, it is immoral.
- **Example:** A student cheating to pass an exam might benefit personally, but if everyone cheated, education would lose its value.
- **Reference:** Mill, J. S. (1863). *Utilitarianism.*

2. Non-Consequentialist Perspective (Deontology/Kantian Ethics)

- **Ethical Theory:** Deontology (Immanuel Kant)
- **Main Idea:** Cheating is inherently wrong, regardless of its consequences.
- **Arguments:**
  - Morality is based on duty, not outcomes.
  - If everyone cheated, trust and fairness would be destroyed, making the action logically inconsistent.
- **Example:** Even if cheating helps someone succeed, it is still morally wrong because it violates honesty and fairness.
- **Reference:** Kant, I. (1785). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals.*

Conclusion

Cheating is a significant moral issue that challenges ethical principles in various aspects of life. While consequentialists evaluate it based on outcomes, non-consequentialists uphold honesty as a fundamental duty. In contemporary society, cheating remains a controversial issue, affecting education, business, politics, and personal relationships.

Examining Moral Issues and Concerns in Contemporary Living: Breaking Promises

A. Definition of Terms

Breaking a Promise: This refers to the act of failing to fulfill a commitment or assurance given to another party. Promises are foundational to trust and cooperation in personal relationships, business dealings, and societal interactions.

B. Kinds of Promise-Breaking

1. **Explicit vs. Implicit Promises**:
   - *Explicit Promises*: Clearly stated commitments, such as a written contract or verbal agreement.
   - *Implicit Promises*: Unspoken but understood commitments, like societal expectations or professional duties.
2. **Minor vs. Major Promises**:
   - *Minor Promises*: Commitments with limited impact, such as promising to call someone back.
   - *Major Promises*: Significant commitments, like marriage vows or business contracts.
3. **Personal vs. Professional Promises**:
   - *Personal Promises*: Commitments in personal relationships, like attending a friend's event.
   - *Professional Promises*: Obligations in a work context, such as meeting project deadlines.

C. Consequentialist and Non-Consequentialist Views

1. Consequentialist Perspective

- **Ethical Theory**: Consequentialism focuses on the outcomes of actions to determine their moral worth.
- **Application to Promise-Breaking**:
  - **Justification**: If breaking a promise leads to better overall consequences than keeping it, a consequentialist might consider it morally permissible.
  - **Critique**: This approach can undermine trust, as it allows for promises to be broken if perceived benefits outweigh harms.
- **Example**: Breaking a promise to attend a meeting to instead assist in an emergency situation, thereby producing a greater good.
- **Reference**: Liberman, A. (2020). *Consequentialism and Promises*. In D. Portmore (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Consequentialism* (pp. 289–309). Oxford University Press.

academic.oup.com

2. Non-Consequentialist Perspective

- **Ethical Theory**: Non-consequentialism, including deontological ethics, asserts that the morality of an action is based on adherence to rules or duties, irrespective of outcomes.
- **Application to Promise-Breaking**:
  - **Obligation**: Promises create moral duties; breaking them is inherently wrong, regardless of consequences.
  - **Critique**: This rigid approach may not account for situations where breaking a promise could prevent significant harm.
- **Example**: Upholding a promise even when breaking it could lead to better outcomes, emphasizing the intrinsic value of trust and duty.
- **Reference**: Gill, M. B. (2012). The non-consequentialist moral force of promises: A response to Sinnott-Armstrong. *Analysis*, 72(3), 506–513.

academic.oup.com

Conclusion

Breaking promises presents complex moral challenges. Consequentialist perspectives evaluate the morality based on outcomes, potentially justifying promise-breaking if it leads to greater good. Non-consequentialist views uphold the intrinsic duty to keep promises, emphasizing trust and moral integrity. In contemporary society, balancing these ethical considerations is crucial for maintaining personal relationships and societal cohesion.

For further reading on the ethical implications of promise-breaking, consider exploring the following resources:

- Liberman, A. (2020). *Consequentialism and Promises*. In D. Portmore (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Consequentialism* (pp. 289–309). Oxford University Press.

academic.oup.com

- Gill, M. B. (2012). The non-consequentialist moral force of promises: A response to Sinnott-Armstrong. *Analysis*, 72(3), 506–513.

Moral Issues and Concerns in Contemporary Living
Week 7: EXAMINING MORAL ISSUES AND CONCERNS IN CONTEMPORARAY LIVING

Stealing, defined as the unauthorized taking of someone else's property with the intent to permanently deprive them of it, is a fundamental ethical concern in contemporary society. It undermines trust, violates property rights, and disrupts social harmony.

A. Definition of Terms

- **Stealing**: The act of taking another person's property without permission or legal right, intending to keep it permanently.

B. Kinds of Stealing

1. **Petty Theft**: Involves stealing items of low monetary value, such as shoplifting inexpensive goods.
2. **Grand Theft**: Pertains to stealing items of significant value, like automobiles or expensive electronics.
3. **Embezzlement**: Misappropriation of funds or property entrusted to one's care, often occurring in corporate settings.
4. **Burglary**: Unlawful entry into a building with the intent to commit theft or another crime.
5. **Robbery**: Taking property from a person through force or intimidation.
6. **Plagiarism**: Using someone else's intellectual property, such as writings or ideas, without proper acknowledgment.

C. Consequentialist and Non-Consequentialist Views

1. **Consequentialist Perspective**
    - **Ethical Theory**: Consequentialism assesses the morality of actions based on their outcomes.
    - **Application to Stealing**:
        - **Justification**: If stealing results in a greater overall benefit, such as stealing to feed a starving family, it might be considered morally permissible.
        - **Critique**: This approach can lead to moral relativism, where the ends justify the means, potentially undermining societal trust and legal systems.
    - **Reference**: The article on consequentialist ethics discusses how actions leading to positive consequences are deemed good, while those leading to negative consequences are seen as bad.

Save My Exams

2. **Non-Consequentialist Perspective**
    - **Ethical Theory**: Non-consequentialism, including deontological ethics, evaluates the morality of actions based on adherence to moral duties and rules, regardless of outcomes.
    - **Application to Stealing**:
        - **Obligation**: Stealing is inherently wrong because it violates moral duties such as respect for others' property rights.
        - **Critique**: This rigid approach may not consider extenuating circumstances where stealing could prevent greater harm.
    - **Reference**: David S. Oderberg, a proponent of non-consequentialist ethics, has extensively discussed the inherent moral duties that deem actions like stealing as intrinsically wrong.

Wikipedia

Conclusion

Stealing presents complex moral challenges. Consequentialist perspectives evaluate its morality based on outcomes, potentially justifying theft in dire circumstances. Non-consequentialist views uphold the intrinsic duty to respect others' property rights, deeming stealing inherently wrong. Balancing these ethical considerations is crucial for maintaining trust and justice in contemporary society.

For further reading on the ethical implications of stealing, consider exploring the works of David S. Oderberg, particularly his discussions on non-consequentialist approaches to ethics.